UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,842	02/12/2004	Larry D. Seiler	00100.02.0039	5902

29153   7590   12/29/2006
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.
C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N.LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER
LUU, MATTHEW

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3663	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/29/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/777,842	SEILER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LUU MATTHEW	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR·THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 October 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7-9 and 11-13</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9 and 11-13</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7-8</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chen et al (US 2003/0030642) in view of Jouppi et al (6,204,859).

Claim 1.

Chen discloses (Figs. 1 and 2) a graphics processor, comprising:

a rasterizer (rasterizer chip 16) operative to generate fragment data for a pixel to

be rendered in response to primitive information (Page 1, section 16, lines 3-7);

a pixel appearance determination circuit (Fig. 2, memory chip 10 having a logic

core 50), coupled to the rasterizer (16), for determining which bits are least important to

the texture representation and eliminated those bits (Page 3, section 25, lines 9-11).

Chen fails to disclose the dropping the fragment data with a "no color"

designation.

However, Jouppi discloses (Figs. 4 and 5) a method for determining the

appearance of a pixel (300), comprising:

receiving fragment data (301, 302 and 400) for a pixel (300) to be rendered;

storing the fragment data in the pixel memory (314); and

determining an appearance value for the pixel based on the stored fragment data, wherein (Fig. 5C) at least one of the stored fragment data (310) is dropped when the number of fragment data per pixel exceeds a threshold value (N=2). Fig. 5C shows the fragment triple data (410) replaces the fragment triple data (310). See column 7, lines 37-67; column 8, lines 21-28; and column 9, lines 26-37.

Jouppi further teaches dropping the fragment data with a no color designation (completely transparency) (Column 15, lines 28-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the method of dropping a "no color" fragment data of Jouppi into the graphics processor of Chen to reduce the amount of time spent rendering the pixels and decreases the memory space for storing the fragment data.

Claim 2.

Chen further discloses (Fig. 2) the determination circuit is a combined memory and logic chip for storing the fragment data (Page 1, section 8; and page 2, section 19, lines 1-11; and section 22, lines 1-8).

Claims 3 and 7.

Chen fails to teach dropping one of the fragment data when the fragment data exceeds a predetermined value N.

However, Jouppi discloses (Fig. 5C) the determination of an appearance value

for the pixel based on the stored fragment data, wherein at least one of the stored

fragment data (310) is dropped when the number of fragment data per pixel exceeds a

threshold value (N=2). Fig. 5C shows the fragment triple data (410) replaces the

fragment triple data (310). Jouppi further discloses (Fig. 6D) the threshold value is N=3

(310, 312 and 410). See column 7, lines 37-67; column 8, lines 21-28; and column 9,

lines 26-37.

Claim 5.

Chen discloses (Fig. 1) a setup unit (a geometry chip 14) operative to generate

the primitive information in response to vertex information (Page 1, section 16, lines 1-

7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in

view of Jouppi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Everitt.

Claim 8

Chen fails to explicitly teach that "wherein the masked sample data is not

dropped, and wherein the masked sample data is used to determine the appearance

value for the pixel.

However, Everitt discloses (Figs. 1 and 4) a graphics processor having a

rasterization pipeline (400) for determining a pixel appearance value (depth value)

based on the fragment data by dropping the fragment data having the least effect on pixel appearance (if the depth values are outside the depth bounds, then the pixel or pixels in the fragment do not need to be rendered and can be discarded) (Page 4, section 32 and 35).

Everitt further teaches "Stencil values are used to mask portions of the output image during rendering, and are used to render a variety of different effects, such as mirrors and shadows" (Section 17, lines 12-15). Everitt further discloses (Fig. 4) a stencil test unit (425) masks all or a portion of the fragment from rendering according to a stencil value stored in the stencil buffer (455) (Page 5, section 42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the stencil values of Everitt to mask the portions of the fragment image of Chen to render a variety of different effects, such as mirrors and shadows, which would effect the appearance value for the pixel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Jouppi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Duluk, Jr. (6,476,807).

Claim 4.

Chen further discloses (Fig. 1) a display controller (display chip 18) operative to provide the pixel appearance value to a display (20) (Page 1, section 16, lines 14-18).

Chen fails to disclose the back end circuit.

However, Duluk, Jr. teaches the back end circuit is used to provide the interface

between the frame buffer and the computer display in a graphics processor system

(Column 28, lines 21-32).

It would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use

the back end circuit of Duluk, Jr. into the graphics processor of Chen since this is

conventional in the art.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 with regard to claims 9 and 11-12 has been

withdrawn since claims 9 and 11-12 have been withdrawn due to the non-elected

invention II.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103 (Claims 1-5 and 7-8)

Applicant argues, at pages 7-8, with respect to Chen and Jouppi, by asserting

that Chen and Jouppi fail to teach "wherein dropping the fragment data further includes

assigning the fragment data to be dropped with a no color designation". The examiner

respectfully disagrees.

Jouppi discloses (Figs. 4 and 5) a method for determining the appearance of a

pixel (300), comprising:

receiving fragment data (301, 302 and 400) for a pixel (300) to be rendered;

storing the fragment data in the pixel memory (314); and

determining an appearance value for the pixel based on the stored fragment

data, wherein (Fig. 5C) at least one of the stored fragment data (310) is dropped when

the number of fragment data per pixel exceeds a threshold value (N=2). Fig. 5C shows

the fragment triple data (410) replaces the fragment triple data (310). See column 7,

lines 37-67; column 8, lines 21-28; and column 9, lines 26-37.

Jouppi further teaches dropping the fragment data with a no color designation

(completely transparency) (Column 15, lines 28-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to

use the method of dropping a "no color" fragment data of Jouppi into the graphics

processor of Chen to reduce the amount of time spent rendering the pixels and

decreases the memory space for storing the fragment data.

Regarding to the Applicant's argument with respect to claims 2-5 and 7-8, note

the rejections as set forth above.

Election With Traverse

Applicant's election with traverse of Invention I (Claims 1-5 and 7-8) in the reply filed on October 14, 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Invention I does not distinct from the invention II. This is not found persuasive because

"Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus such as a printer for printing color image. In addition, the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as a process for gamut clipping of a color image, wherein the least important color can be clipped or cut-off.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper."

Furthermore, these two inventions of Group I and II are distinct from each other as recited in the independent claim 1 and independent claim 9 as following:

Claim 1, lines 4-6:

Determine a pixel appearance value base on <u>the fragment data by dropping the fragment data having the least effect on pixel appearance</u>.

Claim 9, lines 4-6:

Determining an appearance value..., wherein at least on of the stored

fragment data is dropped when the number of fragment data per pixel

exceeds a threshold value.

Therefore, the requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUU MATTHEW whose telephone number is (571) 272-7663. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JACK KEITH can be reached on (571) 272-7663. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Luu

MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER